



CRL OP(MD)No.20142 of 2023

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

( Criminal Jurisdiction )

Date : 22.11.2023

PRESENT

The Hon`ble MR JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL OP(MD)No.20142 of 2023

1.Mathankumar  
2.Mayandi  
3.Mariyammal  
4.Mokkamayan  
5.Vasuki  
6.Sivanandi  
7.Krishnammal  
8.Jeyapriya @ Petchiyammal  
9.Petchi  
10.Mayandi  
11.Nagammal

... Petitioners/ Accused Nos.1 to 11

Vs

The Inspector of Police,  
Periyakulam Police Station,  
Theni District.  
(Cr.No.131 of 2023)

... Respondent/ Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.Arul Jenifer, Advocate  
For Respondent : Mrs.M.Aasha, Government Advocate(Crl.side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.438 of Cr.P.C

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.131 of 2023 on the file of the Respondent  
Police

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



CRL OP(MD)No.20142 of 2023

ORDER: The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 9 and 10 of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act 2006 altered into Sections 9 and 10 of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006 and Section 5(e), 5(j)(ii), 6, 17 POCSO Act, 2012 in Crime No.131 of 2023, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner, with the help of the other petitioners, on 09.09.2020 married the minor girl. Hence the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail.

4.The learned Government Advocate(Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that the investigation in this case is not yet completed.

5.Considering the nature of allegations levelled as against the petitioners and taking into consideration the principles stated by the Honourable Supreme Court in Gurubaksh Singh Sibbia Etc., vs. State of Punjab reported in 1980 AIR 1632 and Lal Kamlendra Pratap Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others reported in (2009)4 SCC 437 and Joginder Kumar vs. State of U.P. and others reported in (1994)4 SCC 260 and taking into consideration the origin of crime, it is seen that the offence



CRL OP(MD)No.20142 of 2023

WEB COPY

alleged as against the petitioners is not a case of heinous crime. Further the petitioners 1 to 3 are having permanent residence at Dindigul District and the petitioners 4 to 9 are having permanent residence at Madurai District and the petitioners 10 and 11 are having permanent residence at Theni District. Hence the principles stated in Hussainara Khatoon & Ors vs. Home Secretary, State Of Bihar reported in AIR 1979 SC 1360 is taken into consideration. In that case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has cautioned that pre-trial detention is not to be encouraged nor is to be encourageable pre-trial release on sureties; that if the Court is satisfied after taking into consideration that the accused has his roots in the community and is not likely to abscond, he can safely be released on his personal bond.

6. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Additional Sessions Judge for POCSO Cases, Theni on condition that the petitioners shall execute a own bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further condition that :



CRL OP(MD)No.20142 of 2023

WEB COPY

[a] the petitioners shall affix his photograph and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioners shall report before the concerned trial Court on summons.

[c] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229A IPC.

sd/-  
22/11/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

/12/2023

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai - 625 023.

gns

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



CRL OP(MD)No.20142 of 2023

TO

WEB COPY

1 THE ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE FOR POCSO CASES, THENI.

2 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, PERIYAKULAM POLICE STATION,  
THENI DISTRICT.

3 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,  
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1 CC to M/s.A.ARUL JENIFER, Advocate ( SR-16802[I] dated 23/11/2023 )

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.20142 of 2023

Date :22/11/2023

RS/JGB/SAR-(07.12.2023) 5P 5C

Madurai Bench of Madras High Court is issuing  
certified copies in this format from 17/07/2023